

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed 07/17/03, the examiner indicated that the allowable subject matter has been withdrawn. In an Office Action mailed 05/07/03, the examiner indicated that the subject matter from claim was allowable, and as a result, applicants incorporated the subject matter from claim 3 into claim 1 in the Amendment mailed 05/13/2003. In the Office Action mailed 07/17/03, the examiner withdrew the indicated allowability of claim 3 in view of FIG. 2, in Taguchi. Applicants respectfully submit that FIG. 2A does not show the subject matter from claim 3, which reads in part, "the baffle opening has an area that is approximately double the area of the inflator housing." FIG. 2A does not show that the second through hole 22b is approximately double the area of the inflator opening. The first through holes 22a and the second through hole 22b are not represented in FIG. 2A, and thus it is impossible to compare the size of the through holes 22a and 22b to the size of the inflator opening.

FIG. 2A does show a dashed line on the top of the inner bag. This dashed line does not correspond to the second through hole 22b but rather corresponds to a thread 254 connecting the first and second cloth members 221 and 222 of the inner bag (col. 5 lines 46-57). FIG. 2A does not have the reference character 254, however, FIG. 8B contains reference character 254. FIG. 8B is an inverted representation of FIG. 2B. FIG. 2B is a partial cross-sectional schematic illustration of the first embodiment. FIGs. 5A to 8B show the manufacturing method for the first embodiment (col. 4, lines 23-27) and thus FIG. 2A and FIG. 2B show the same partial cross section, but include different reference characters.

Since FIG. 2B fails to show through holes 22a and 22b, FIG. 2B can not be relied upon to show that Taguchi et al. teaches an inner airbag having a through hole that is approximately double the area of the inflator opening. Moreover, FIG. 2A shows a second through hole 22b that is a fraction of the size of the inflator opening as defined by the inflator housing. In conclusion, applicants submit that the subject matter from claim 3 should be allowed, and since claim 3 has previously been added to main claim 1, claim 1 should be allowed. Furthermore, all pending dependent claims should also be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Jarett Rieger
Registration No. 48,864
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Breed Technologies, Inc.
P.O. Box 33050
Lakeland, Florida 33807-3050
Phone (863) 668-6403
Fax (863) 668-6130